REMARKS

In response to the above-mentioned Office Action dated 07/10/2007, specification has been amended, and claims 2-10, 12, 15 and 19 have been canceled and claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 16-18 and 20 have been amended to conform to the specification and the figures filed such that they are now in condition allowable.

Regarding rejection of claims 1-12 and 17 under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite and/or incomplete, they are now amended to make it definite and complete as shown in FIGs 1. and 2. (which shows aircraft) and as the term 'cloud seeding' is well-accepted in the Technology of Rainmaking which means to disperse powder or particle of certain substance(s) into a cloud mass from an airplane or any other vehicles that can perform the same job. There is no omitted element in claim 17 as Page 13, l. 19-20 clearly describes the location of seeding within a cloud mass, in addition to the shape how the dispersion is performed either as a linear or a coil shape within a cloud mass. Claim 17 has also been amended to overcome this limitation. The Examiner cited that the informal definitions of the techniques, e.g. fattening do not define a process in dependent form; the amended claims 13 and 16 have now clearly defined the process of fattening.

Regarding rejection of claims 13-16 and 19 under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed method of 'moving' clouds appears to be inoperative and therefore lacks utility; applicant contend and would like to explain that these various ways of 'moving clouds' has been experimentally performed successfully and found to be very useful as has been clearly described in the specification, Pages 13-14, that cloud mass from one locality can be moved to a different locality of various circumstances where all the parameters such as speed and direction of wind, humidity and more, all need to be taken into account. As cited by the Examiner 'There is no well-established utility of these claims', this is because NO ONE yet on earth ever succeed to achieve these advanced steps of 'Moving' cloud as

described in the Royal Rainmaking Technology. We have, however, found it very useful in Thailand during the experiment as to cause rainfall in the locality on the other side of the mountain where the cloud mass stuck onto. The relocation of a cloud mass is certainly very useful in the aspect of water management. This should be the best way of water management considering the cost-benefit obtained.

Regarding that claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; when the term 'cloud seeding' is used, it's known among the person performing Rainmaking Technology and it has been drawn clearly in the Rainmaking chart of FIG. 2 that aircraft is used to deliver the various chemical agents for rainmaking purpose. Claims and the specification have presently been amended to overcome the rejections with no new matter introduced. Page 3, l. 22-25 and page 5, l. 22-24 described clearly that all the advanced knowledge of meteorology, climatology, cloud formation, cloud evolution, rain formation and cloud dispersion of various aspects in each season must all be taken into account such that rainmaking is now experimentally performed successfully in Thailand to target the locality of rainfall. This is a very advanced knowledge of rainmaking deserved protection of the intellectual property where no one ever invents, yet one of ordinary skill in the art can perform after being trained.

Regarding that claims 13-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC § 112 as being not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention; after filing the present patent application we have experimented and performed this rainmaking method and achieved good water management of the country which would be very useful to mankind thus asserted valuable utility as set forth above.

Regarding claims 1-5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Montmory (4,362,271) in view of Fukuta (6,056,203), most claims of

Montmory use seeding of liquid particles or composition containing dimethyl sulfoxide as principal active ingredient having additional ingredient (i.e. sodium chloride, calcium chloride and etc.) being soluble in dimethyl sulfoxide, and that he also mentions (Col. 3, l. 7-17) about disadvantages of using a solid particle dispersion to support his use of liquid particles. No claims of his invention use these salts as powder or solid particles. Fukuta ('203) also teaches method for seeding clouds with liquid coolant (which is liquid carbon dioxide, liquid propane, liquid air or liquid nitrogen) within containers by spraying laterally from nozzles of the aircraft to produce ice crystals. The present invention, however, teaches successful use of solid particles as powder or flakes in the sequential steps of making rain. Thus, both Montmory and Fukuta teach inventions totally different from the present invention. Fukuta yet mentioned that the ground-seeded AgI smoke particles does not function well, and the AgI smoke will be carried upwards by the updraft without substantial ice nucleation and.. (col.2, l.32-34) .

Claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Montmory (4,362,271) in view of Fukuta (6,056,203), and further in view of Mather (5,357,865), applicant again contend that both Montmory and Fukuta use liquid composition either as salt solution in dimethyl sulfoxide or liquid coolant while Mather (claim 1) uses burning, in a seeding flare, a pyrotechnic formulation to produce hygroscopic seeding particles which are mixtures of KCl and NaCl in various ratio combined and not singly as powder of NaCl to be released from said seeding flare to initiate rainfall. All these three inventions do not claim the use of powder chemical agent(s) as such, they use the chemicals in solution or in mixture which is not concentrate or not as effective as disclosed in the present invention.

Regarding claims 11, 12 and 18, an additional process of initiating rainfall by 'Super Sandwich Technique' disclosed in the present invention, the Examiner cited that

"attacking" is taught by the combination of the procedures taught by Mather ('865), Knollenberg ('992) and Fukuta ('203), applicant contend that Mather uses a different means of seeding cloud, i.e. burning, in a seeding flare, while Knollenberg introduces into a cloud mass (Cl. 1 &11) the solid substance which is urea where the Examiner cited further that Fukuta ('203) in claim 1 teaches the use of silver iodide flares seeded into the top of a cloud. The fact is that Fukuta neither in '203 nor '455 claims the use of AgI flares, he only claims the use of liquid carbon dioxide (LC) spraying from nozzles into supercooled cloud or fog. Thus, as a whole even in combination of the procedures taught in these three inventions, these are significantly different procedures as Mater uses different means of seeding cloud, burning, while Knollenberg introduces the solid substance into a cloud mass but the present invention claims dispersing urea at cloud base simultaneously as AgI is seeded into the cloud top and flakes of dry ice are dispersed below said cloud base and NOT into supercooled cloud or fog as claimed by Fukuta ('203 & '455). The present invention would have not been obvious to any one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as the process and specified position in cloud mass the chemicals are seeded to are different. Claim 12 has been canceled and claims 11 and 18 have been amended such that as a whole, both are distinctly different from what disclosed in the cited prior arts. The similar reasons are applied to Claims 8, 9 and 10 of the present invention. Claims 8-10, however, have been canceled.

The above reasons further applied to claims 13-16 and 20 which are also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Mather (5,357,865), in view of Montmory (4,362,271) and further in view of U.S. Patent No 3,659,785 to Nelson et al. and ever further in view of Knollenberg, and still even further in view of Fukuta (5,628,455) , and yet still even further in view of Fukuta (6,056,203) and where Nelson (claim 1) claims the removing (NOT 'moving) water vapor from the atmosphere using

hygroscopic particulate material encapsulated in a moisture permeable coating to dissipate fog.

Regarding claim 20, non of the combination cited by the Examiner taught the alternate dropping of chemicals in a manner taught in the present invention while dispersing powder of hygroscopic chemicals on top of developing clouds. This is one of the most useful technique of rainmaking in a rather close area locates in between many mountain tops. As a whole this claim 20 is thus allowable.

As now all the remaining claims have been amended to overcome the limitation and all phrases have been read into the claims to make them definite and distinctly different than what described in the prior arts. Applicant thus submit and that all amended claims may now be allowed and would appreciate if the application is allowed in the next communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Ampol Senanarong

Dated: October 1,2007

Dr. Ampol Senanarong

Privy Councillor

The Office of His Majesty's Principal Private Secretary
Bangkok 10200, THAILAND.